Evening Session

SECOND READING

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 10 - An **Act respecting the Enforcement of Extraprovincial Custody Orders**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of an Act respecting the Enforcement of Extra-provincial Custody Orders. Mr. Speaker, it's proposed in this bill to enact legislation which will facilitate the enforcement in Saskatchewan of custody orders made by a court or courts outside of the province of Saskatchewan. The bill is designed to deal with a situation where a person, very frequently a parent, usually a parent, in breach of the terms of the custody order made in another province and which grants custody of a child to the other parent, absconds, if that's the correct word, to Saskatchewan with that child. At common law, a Saskatchewan court in considering such a custody order is not obliged to enforce it according to its terms, but rather must form an independent judgment on the matter. The parents to whom custody was granted by the court in the other province would have to apply here in the Saskatchewan court for, in effect, yet another custody application and custody order and the Saskatchewan court on such an application would be obliged to rehear the entire matter. And is, of course, not bound by the provisions of the extra-provincial, original custody order.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to prevent, or to curtail in any event, what might be the abusive of the common law rule in many cases by some individuals who have been described as in effect, civil kidnappers, who move from jurisdiction to jurisdiction demanding successive rehearings of the custody issue, exhausting the legal process, involving usual fairly large sums of money in terms of legal and other costs. The bill accomplishes this by obliging the Saskatchewan courts to enforce the order and restore the child to the person to whom custody was granted by the extra-provincial court. Thus placing the onus on the would-be civil kidnapper, so called, to apply to the extra-provincial court that made the order for variation of same. The bill will, it is hoped, rid the kidnapper of the advantage to be gained, which she or he may have, by moving from province to province with the child and thereby starting all again the legal and financial process that I described. Mr. Speaker, the bill is a flexible one, in that it permits the Saskatchewan courts to vary the order, if the child no longer has a substantial connection with the province in which the original order was made and has a substantial connection with Saskatchewan or if all of the parties reside in this province. Mr. Speaker, this bill was originally proposed as a uniform bill by the Conference of Commissioners on the Uniformity of Legislation in Canada. All of the provinces are moving for the implementation of this uniform bill in order to make the applicability of the law identical in the enforcement of extra-provincial custody orders and thereby come to grips with the problem of so-called civil kidnapping. The court for the purposes of this bill would include the Court of Queen's Bench and the Unified Family Court project which is before this House in consideration on adjourned debates second readings. Mr. Speaker, it must be stressed that this law will do nothing to aid to aid the situation whereby, a person leaves with a child, withstanding a custody order leaves the country entirely, there of course, international law and treaties and relationships would have the play but this bill will make a very giant step forward in removing many of the

inequities and hardships which now exist as between various provinces in Canada and Canadians. With those few, brief words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 10, an Act respecting the Enforcement of Extra-provincial Custody Orders.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to say that we, in the Liberal caucus will support this legislation, we're very pleased to see the government with this, with the unified family court Bill and with some of the other legislation that they have for this session, finally addressing themselves to some of the problems that couples face on the occasion of marriage breakdown. We consider this to be good legislation, similarly having consulted with my colleague, Mr. Cameron, on that particular bill, legislation such as that, which will come in a moment regarding subpoenas, is good legislation. I hope that the Attorney General might consider at the next conference of Attorneys General addressing himself to the question of husbands absconding out of a jurisdiction, almost half of the permanent social welfare recipients are in fact, single parents. So that if you have a husband that skips from Saskatchewan to Manitoba or Ontario, the result is that we on behalf of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan find ourselves picking up the price for somebody else's children and somebody else's problem. We could have a far better program than we have under the current reciprocal enforcement of children maintenance orders act legislation. We could have a program similar to that in Germany where judgments from one jurisdiction are automatically registerable and the garnishee from one jurisdiction can garnishee in another jurisdiction. I just say to the Attorney General that if is he's looking at this whole area of marital law that's an important vacancy and important gap in our law now which puts a great strain on women and a strain on the public purse of the Department of Social Services.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 11 - **An Act respecting the Interprovincial Adoption of Subpoenas.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is as the title indicates obviously, legislation designed to cope with a particular problem which has been outstanding for quite some time in judicial matters. Bill No. 11 is an act respecting the Interprovincial Adoption of Subpoenas.

Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, persons are subject only to the jurisdiction of the courts of the province in which they reside. And there has never been a procedure for securing the attendance of witnesses who may be required for civil suits who are outside the province in which the suit is brought. And as I've indicated, the general provision is that we, as people of Saskatchewan, are subject only to the jurisdiction of the courts in the province of Saskatchewan here in which we reside.

It is proposed to enact a bill which is before the House, which would require our courts to adopt subpoenas and civil matters from outside of the province and require residents of Saskatchewan to attend outside of the province to give evidence. For example, a person commencing a civil action in a court in Manitoba who needed the evidence of a person who is a resident of Saskatchewan could have a subpoena issued and then apply to a Manitoba court for the required judges' certificate as to the necessity of the evidence. The Saskatchewan court would then adopt that subpoena and require the Saskatchewan resident to attend and to give evidence in Manitoba. The bill, which is before you, Mr. Speaker, would also permit a person who commences a civil action in a court in Saskatchewan to have a subpoena issued and apply to a judge

here for the required certificate where he needs the evidence of a person who is conversely or similarly resident in a province outside of Saskatchewan. The one perhaps caveat, which is attached to this, is that that other province would also have to have similar legislation in force. The courts in that other province would then adopt the 'subpoena under the provisions of this bill, The Interprovincial Subpoena Act, and require that person to attend and give evidence here in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I will not get into the clause by clause details as I think these can be best dealt with in the Committee of the Whole, I would point out, however, that the bill provides that the witness fees and travelling expenses of the person subpoenaed must be paid by the person who subpoenas him. It also provides that a person who fails to comply with a subpoena which has been adopted is in contempt of court.

This bill, like the previous one, Mr. Speaker, was originally proposed at the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of the Law; it has been enacted in three other provinces, Manitoba, Newfoundland and British Columbia, and we will be the fourth province in Canada to adopt this, what I consider to be a very worthwhile piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 11.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill 12 - **An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, 1968.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 12 is an act to amend the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, 1968. These are not major amendments. In this act, we propose to amend the definitions of court and proper registration officer to include the Unified Family Court and the local registrar of that court. Members will quite obviously and readily recognize that the purpose of this bill is to give Unified Family Court judges jurisdiction compared with that of judges of the Court of Queen's Bench and the District Court to deal with matters under this act. In essence, Mr. Speaker, one might generally describe this bill as a consequential piece of legislation which is part of a general package of legislation designed to shift jurisdiction in family law matters or family law related matters into the proposed pilot project which is the Unified Family Court.

Mr. Speaker, with those very few brief words, I move second reading of Bill No. 12.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, while the amendments are before you let me only remind the Attorney General that the absolutely incredible lousy operation that other offices of the Attorney General do across Canada of enforcing Reciprocal Maintenance Orders and I assume that your office does the same incredibly lousy job. I don't know, but I can't imagine now that he has a new found, if temporary interest, in legal matters at the next meeting of the Attorneys General to examine the operation across Canada of The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act because it is not working very effectively.

Now with those positive comments we, of course, will be supporting these amendments.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one or two words in brief rebuttal perhaps to the remarks made by the hon. member for Regina

Wascana.

My remarks really are not intended to be too critical of the hon. member for Wascana, but I would like to point out to the members of the House that I don't believe in six and one half years that I have been Attorney General (and this bill has been around sine 1968) that I have heard once in writing from the hon. member for Wascana on this particular issue and the remarks that he has made, nor may I say (not just to single out the member for Wascana) have I heard from the Law Society of Saskatchewan or from individual other members of the Bar.

MR. MERCHANT: — It's so . . . they didn't think to write.

MR. ROMANOW: — The hon. member says it's so bad that they didn't think to write and I am saying to the hon. member for Wascana that the Law Society of Saskatchewan every year meets in convention and deals with resolutions which the lawyers feel are of some importance and interest and I look to that body to give me direction in this area. I am not arguing that the situation is perfect, but I do argue that it is just simply not good enough for the member for Wascana to get up and make some general comments because apparently he doesn't think it is sufficiently important to put it down in writing to me or sufficiently important to put it down in a resolution to the Law Society of Saskatchewan to me, but it is sufficiently important to apparently make a few remarks on a second reading speech and then say "take it up with the Attorneys General of the rest of the provinces." On what evidence that is before us, Mr. Speaker? So I don t want to belabour the point, Mr. Speaker, but I do say to the hon. member that he does not set a good standard or a good course to follow in this particular area because if there is legitimate need for change in the law then I would invite him to communicate with me in a way that I can take a look at the cases, where I can see where the experiences are bad, where I can go to my colleagues say in Nova Scotia and say, look, here is the member for Wascana who says this is his experience with your department of the Attorney General, or I can go to my colleague in British Columbia or Alberta and say here is what the Law Society says is the experience about your lawyers not paying attention to this matter. I will undertake to him that I will do that and perhaps even call for a federal-provincial, or at least a provincial look at it, but I am not going to do it based on a few cursory words said in the course of a second reading speech here tonight. He is going to have to provide me with some detailed information before I proceed further on that.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill 13 - **An Act to amend The Surrogate Court Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill and the next bill are in a sense complementary bills. I would like to give this brief second reading explanation of the act which is before the House, namely an act to amend The Surrogate Court Act.

The amendment that is before the members of the House is considered necessary so that the province can avoid incurring financial responsibility for any supernumerary judge of the district court who performs occasional duties under The Surrogate Court Act.

By section 8(1) of The District Court Act, supernumerary judges holding the office created by subsection 7(a) are judges of the district court. Section 6 of The Surrogate Court Act provides that the Surrogate Court shall consist of the same number of judges as there are in the district court and the judges of the district court shall be judges of the

Surrogate Court. Therefore, supernumerary judges as judges of the District Court are also judges of the Surrogate Court. Under Section 95 as it presently reads, supernumerary judges who may perform Surrogate Court duties for a week would receive the same payment as a District Court judge who regularly performs Surrogate Court duties throughout the year on a regular basis.

I think all members would agree that that kind of an arrangement would appear to be inappropriate under the amount of work and responsibility that is involved. The judges have expressed their agreement to this particular amendment to try and avoid that kind of a circumstance. Therefore it is being provided that supernumerary judges will not be entitled to payment under the present Section 95. As I say we have had this matter for consideration before the District Court judges who concur in the proposal which is before you.

Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The District Court Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill 14 – **An Act to amend The District Court Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 14 is an Act respecting The District Court Act. The Judges Act of Canada provides for the establishment of the office of supernumerary judge among the judges of the District Court where such office is established by provincial legislation.

The creation of a supernumerary judge within each province requires enabling legislation by the province. This is the purpose of this proposed amendment. The federal provisions allow a judge who has attained the age of 65 years and who has been a judge for 15 years or a judge of the age of 70 years who has held office for 10 years to elect to hold the office of supernumerary judge. Such an office enables that judge to perform such judicial duties which allows the court to better facilitate the emergency situations and special duty assignments arising from time to time which conflict with the ordinary sittings and the regular judicial duties. Compulsory retirement in the court is normally the age of 70 for these judges but in electing to occupy the supernumerary office the judge is allowed to remain active for a longer period.

Through the use of the supernumerary judge, the District Court will have a greater capacity to attend to its work load in the court as the supernumerary office is created upon the election by the Judge, frees one of the existing positions and allows the appointment of a new judge to fill that office vacated by the judge who elects to become a supernumerary. Members of the House will recall that a similar amendment was enacted by this Legislature in 1972 for this province allowing for this procedure of supernumeraries in the area of the Court of Queen's Bench. Mr. Speaker, it is anticipated that existing judges of the District Court, qualifying and electing to occupy the office of the supernumerary judge, will add considerable flexibility and capacity to the District Court by providing an available source of experienced Judges to deal with illnesses, to deal with emergencies and to aid the existing judges in attending to backlogs which may develop during heavy sittings or unexpectedly lengthy trials. Mr. Speaker, these judges will also be available to perform special judicial duties that may be assigned to them, or pursuant to provincial law, with a minimal disruption of normal sittings and duties. The special duties will therefore not place additional strain on the existing circuits and jobs. The salary of the supernumerary judge is maintained and is

the responsibility of the federal authorities, so that the financial burden on the province is not placed through any significant financial burden apart from perhaps office space is not placed upon the province through the creation of the office of the supernumerary, although as I've indicated space and related facilities will obviously have to be furnished by the province for this additional position. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to Section 8 of the Act is considered necessary to ensure that supernumerary judges appointed under subsection 7A are recognized to be under our jurisdiction as judges of the District Court. The amendment makes supernumerary judges members of the Court. which is necessary as jurisdiction is conferred on the court and not the judges under the act. Mr. Speaker, I move, Bill No. 14 an act to amend the District Court Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I want to address some comment to this Bill. It's a bill which affects the makeup of the District Court in Saskatchewan and I know the Attorney General will acknowledge in the replies to me that I did write him some time ago by letter, suggesting that we ought to have some jurisdictional changes in respect to the District Court and I want to indicate to members the suggestions I made to him and ask him if, in fact, those suggestions are receiving some consideration and when we might expect some amendments in those respects. And they are these.

We have in civil terms in the province now, three levels of jurisdiction in the Courts. First, the Magistrates' Jurisdiction extends up to $500, that's the civil jurisdiction, which the Attorney General's Department and the Legislature has given to Judges of the Magistrate's Courts appointed by the provincial government. They can't handle any cases beyond $500 in value. Then, we have a second level of court which is the District Court in the province, which can handle cases under our District Court Act up to $5,000 in value. Then there is the Queen's Bench Court, which can handle cases in excess of $5,000 Anything above $5,000 is taken to the Queen's Bench, between $500 and $5,000 goes to the District Court. The distinction between the District Court and the Queen's Bench Court in some terms is this, the District Court Judges are resident in their areas, they are local residents, they are accessible on a virtually daily basis and certainly a weekly basis in chambers. The Queen's Bench Judges, as the Attorney General knows are resident either in Saskatoon or Regina and are on circuit. The Queen's Bench Court doesn't have as easy access for people to it, as the District Court does which is the local court.

Now we haven't had a change in the monetary level of the jurisdiction in the District Courts since 1967, when it was raised from $1,200 to $5,000, which means now over the course of the last 10 years the jurisdiction of the local court, the District Court, has been eroded significantly by inflation, so that we are now getting to the point where cases of only a rather modest variety of civil case can go to the District Court. I have suggested to the Attorney General by letter some time ago that he should consider and I would have hoped we've had some amendments in this session to increase the monetary jurisdiction of the District Court from $5,000 to about $10,000 to begin with, and secondly, to increase its jurisdiction up to $50,000 in the event you get the agreement of the parties. Very often two parties will want to have a matter tried readily and locally before the District Court but if it happens to exceed $5,000 in value they can't do it. If we raise the usual limit, the $5,000 limit up to 10 to $15,000, they could go

to their local District Court in respect to those issues. Thirdly, I've suggested that if they have a dispute in excess of $15,000, but under $50,000 if they both agree, it ought to be tried before the District Court in the local area where it's simpler and less expensive and more accessible to them. Also suggested, at the same time that we should consider increasing the Magistrate's jurisdiction above $500 up to $1,000 and I take the occasion, to speak to those suggestions about further reform since the act now before us relates to the make-up of the District Court and I would hope the Attorney General would indicate to me that his department is considering those suggestions. I hope, in fact, he's gone to the Chief Justices and asked them their opinions, because I think that, (a) there is a very definite need for an increase in the monetary level of the District Court from $5,000 up at least to 10 to 15 thousand, and secondly, I think it would serve the communities very well if there was a concurrent jurisdiction with the Queen's Bench between 15 and 50, so if the parties agreed they could go to the District Court up to $50,000 in the event of a dispute but we certainly support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would only rise to say that I think the suggestion made by the member for Regina South is a good suggestion, and indeed I do acknowledge the fact that he has submitted it to me some time in advance of this. I am hopeful that there may be some additional amendments in The District Court Act or any event I will be in a position to deal with this matter before the spring session or before the spring part of this session runs out.

The larger issue which is raised here, or at least is raised in my mind, I know that you can separate the two, is I suppose the general issue of melding the two courts, the District Court and Queen's Bench into one, in effect, consolidated court, totally eliminating the differences and distinctions between District Court and Queen's Bench. At the time of the receipt of your letter as the hon. member will know, I have for some time been considering this as a fairly broad sweeping reform of the law. Whether it is good or bad I suppose is open to one particular view but I kind of hold the bias that there is some merit to this. At the time I thought that rather than doing it on a piecemeal fashion, namely going to 15,000 and then ultimately going to 50,000 by consent, perhaps we should be looking at the larger substantive policy issue, namely that we simply eradicate the District Courts and amalgamate them with the Queen's Bench and make it into one consolidated court. The hon. member will not be surprised if I close parenthetically speaking that that idea has had mixed reception in some quarters of the bar and in some quarters of the judiciary. The result is it has not progressed very much further. The result is that your proposal has also been kind of left in limbo pending the larger decision. But I do want to indicate to the member that we have not forgotten it, we are looking at it and we will see if I can give a report to the House at the time of my estimates later in the spring or perhaps even in the form of a bill later in the spring.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed and bill read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 15 - **An Act to amend The Revised Statutes Act, 1974.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the most recent revision of provincial statutes was in 1965 and the revision before that was in 1953. Obviously a revision is due.

In 1974 The Revised Statutes Act was enacted creating a Statute Revision Committee and empowering that committee to prepare and arrange for the publication of the consolidation and the consolidated and revised statutes of Saskatchewan. I must report to the House that that committee has been very active since 1974 and in fact at this time has already sent the first of the revision materials to be printed. However, the revised Statutes Act of 1974 only authorized the committee to include in the revisions legislation passed in the 1973-74 legislative session and the two sessions immediately following and provided that the revised statutes would be referred to as the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, in as much as the work of the committee is not yet complete, those two requirements of the act cannot be complied with, perhaps should not be complied with. It now appears that the work of the Statute Revision Committee will be completed

during 1978 and so it is proposed that section 4 be amended to authorize the committee to include the four legislative sessions following the 1973-74 session and if the completed work in effect comes at the end of the session 1978, it is hoped this will be entitled the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1978. And I think that that does make eminent good sense and, accordingly, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading of this bill.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): - Just a comment, Mr. Speaker. It has been under consideration for some considerable period of time about the computer printing of the revised statutes and moving to the loose leaf system as opposed to the bound volumes. There was some dispute, as I recall, between the type of system considered by the federal government and say the type of system implemented in Manitoba. I realize this is a fairly innocuous bill but the idea, I think, of computer printing of the statutes in maintaining a continuous revision is something to be considered by the government. I would urge the Attorney General to seriously consider it and implement it as soon as possible. I think it has a great deal of merit. We see today the problems of attempting to do a revision with a vast number of bills and statutes passed by this Assembly. I know now that we have gone to it for Hansard and we are getting the immediate printing. I think it has a great deal of merit and I would urge the Attorney General, if it is at all possible, to speed up the study of that aspect and implement it in Saskatchewan.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, again I believe that this is a very worthwhile suggestion that the member for Qu'Appelle has made. Personally, I believe in the computerization of statutes, the so-called loose leaf binder system of statutes, although I think the member would agree with me that there would be perhaps no unanimity in this regard as far as many members of the bar. It depends on whom you talk to, of course, but I have had many lawyers who are comfortable with the bound, fixed statutes and the revisions that come out periodically every ten years or so and they have a feeling of comfortableness with this. I know that in my discussions with a number of people about the loose leaf folder there is a kind of a built in resistance to it.

I do want to say, however, that a considerable amount of work has been already carried out with respect to the computerization of statutes. We have engaged an outside expert from Queen's University, I forget the name right now. He has done this in the past for other provinces. The question of money becomes very relevant. I tell the member for Qu'Appelle. I think the position that I can summarize for the government at this stage of the game is simply put this way - that if on Treasury Board's assessment of the budgetary priorities that are before Treasury Board for this coming budget, the cost factors, the cost benefit analysis works out somehow to the reasonable favor of computerization, I am quite confident that we will also be introducing that at the time of the revisions. This is the right time to do it, you're dead right, so that decision has not yet been made it is still somewhere at the lower echelons of the Budget Bureau Treasury Board for preparation. I'd personally support it without trying to close off any options for my colleagues but that's the kind of situation. So I would say to the member if he could wait for a couple of months, I'll undertake at the spring session to provide him all the details of the names of the advisors, costs and everything else, and we can talk about an estimate at that stage in the game if that is O.K.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill 16 **An Act to amend The Court Officials Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the three amendments which are proposed to this bill, An Act

to amend The Court Officials Act, are all incidental to the passage of The Unified Family Court Act. Section 17 would establish the hours for the staff of that court as the same hours required for the staff of the Court of Appeal, Court of Queen's Bench, District Court and Surrogate Court. Section 42 deals with the duties of the registrars or clerks of the Court of Queen's Bench and District Court to receive and keep records including bank accounts and to attend this Chamber Court during chamber sittings. The proposed amendment to that section would create the same requirements for the local registrar of the Unified Family Court.

Section 43 in the bill before you authorizes the appointment of inspectors to inspect the offices of the different courts and report to the Attorney General. The proposed amendment would authorize these same inspections of the Unified Family Court as well as the other courts and as the other courts are being inspected.

Mr. Speaker, those are the sum and substance of the amendments which are before you. They are as I've described them incidental or consequential to the passage of The Unified Family Court Act. It is proposed that they come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation rather than on a set of course, in order to give us the flexibility for the establishment of the Unified Family Court. I move second reading of this bill.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — I just want to make an observation in passing of some credit to the Attorney General. I think when he was asked by press some months ago as to whether this would be a heavy or light session he indicated it would be a light session, we didn't really have a lot to do in the absence of CIGOL. Then the Premier was asked a couple of weeks later the same question and he said that no, he expected it to be a relatively heavy session. He had some 90 odd bills or something or other. I give to the Attorney General more honesty in that respect that I give to the Premier. Now the fact is that all these bills we've seen here could readily have been put into an omnibus bill which would have made the Attorney General's prediction quite accurate as distinct from the Premier's. It looks as though this kind of stretched out into several bills to give some sort of support to the Premier's proposition that it would be a heavier session. But with that little credit to the Attorney General for his more accurate assessment of the session in the absence of CIGOL, we'll support this bill.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to argue, I'm just going to take careful note of the fact that the Liberal Opposition is of the view that apart from CIGOL this is a very light session. I will particularly take note of that when we come to debate the Education Act on consolidations. I will take particular note of that when we deal with other appropriate legislation which comes down in the future. Finally, I would say only in passing, Mr. Speaker, that it's so very difficult to know exactly what is light and what is heavy in the minds of the opposition. It varies like Nathan Detroit's floating crap game from place to place, sometimes it's heavy and sometimes it's light and sometimes it's controversial but I do believe that this package of legislation which is before the House, especially the lead bills; Unified Family Court, the Interprovincial Adoption of Subpoenas, the Extra Provincial Custody Orders are very major reforms, including the consequential bills which the House should fully consider. I move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 17 – **An Act to amend The Trustee**

Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at common law a married woman was incapable of holding or conveying property as a bare trustee. This section was enacted to give a married woman power to so hold property. However, The Married Woman's Property Act removes any disability that a married woman had at common law to hold and dispose of real and personal property. Accordingly, Section 40 is redundant and can be repealed. This section is discriminatory against married women on the basis of sex and marital status. Its repeal has been recommended to the government by the co-ordinator for the status of women as a result of a study of various statutes in the province of Saskatchewan. I move second reading of an act to amend The Trustee Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW moved second reading of Bill No. 18 — **An Act to amend The Limitation of Actions Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Limitation of Actions Act and the Trustee Act are required to remove certain discriminatory features contained in these two acts. In putting forward the amendments, in response to a request which came to the department from the minister as he then was the minister in charge of the status of women, the hon. Ed. Tchorzewski, the amendments to these bills fulfil the purpose of removing a reference to a married woman where there is no corresponding reference to a married man. In addition, the development of the common law and the enactment of our Married Woman's Property Act, as I explained in the earlier bill, render both references to a married woman in D Section superfluous and they should be removed. At common law, as I have indicated, a married woman did not have the legal capacity to own or dispose of property. This was true even where a married woman was named a trustee of an estate, therefore, the existing Section 40 in The Trustee Act was necessary to remove the disability but recent case law and the recent Married Woman's Property Act amendments make this section unnecessary. As a result of the legal incapacity of a married woman to own or dispose of property the courts in England created two fictions. First it was possible to convey properly to a person for the separate use of a married woman. This in essence was the forerunner of the trust concept as we know it today. Property conveyed to a married woman for a separate use actually made the married woman a beneficiary under the trust. Then to ensure that a married woman to whom property was conveyed by separate use could not dispose of the property, there was developed the power to restrain a married woman's power of anticipation, namely her powers to dispose of the property. Hence, the property could be conveyed to a married woman for a separate use with or without restraint upon anticipation. In this bill, the limitations of actions act, section 43, sub (2) which is amended here, was originally enacted to ensure that a trustee was entitled to claim the benefit of limitation period when action was brought by a married woman who was a beneficiary by virtue of the property being conveyed to the trustees for a separate use. This now is rendered not necessary as a result of the developments in the law of the married woman properties act rendering this portion of the section superfluous and the amendment which is before the House. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Limitation of Actions Act.

Motion agreed to and bill now read a second time.

HON. RJ. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 19 - **An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in 1971 The Legal Profession Act was amended to create the law foundation which was empowered to establish and maintain a fund to be used for the purpose of legal education, legal research and law reform. In part of those amendments it was provided in section 44(e) that a solicitor would pay to the law foundation all interest received on moneys that he holds in trust for his clients. This requirement was made subject to the power of the client to require that he receive that interest. The exception is expressed in section 44(e), sub 4 of the law. The Law Society of Saskatchewan has raised the concern with me, that section 44(e) sub 4 creates particularly refer to sub (a) of that section, creates a possibility that after interest is credited to a solicitor's trust account with no arrangement that that interest remain the client's property and therefore, the interest becomes owing the law foundation that the client could by a written demand require the solicitor to pay that interest to him thereby putting the solicitor out of pocket conceivably the amount of the interest. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to ensure that an agreement between the solicitor and the client making interest on trust accounts the property of the client will only effect interest credited to the trust account of the solicitor after the agreement is entered into.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act.

Motion agreed to and bill now read a second time.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 20 – **An Act to amend The Administration of Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I now rise to give another dissertation with respect to an Act to amend The Administration of Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons Act. I want particularly the Member for Moosomin, pay careful attention to these provisions of the bill. Thank you very much. It's proposed to amend section 7 of the Act, by adding thereto: section 7(a), (d) (a), I only say that in jest, I say to the hon. member for Moosomin. I know he is a man with a sense of humour. The reason for this amendment is that the present section 7 does not give the administrator of estates the power to do such things as purchase clothing, medical aid, drugs, and other personal necessities for the mentally incompetent parson as well as to pay for his room and board. This amendment is intended therefore, to give the administrator of estates the power to effectively manage the mentally incompetent persons estate by allowing him to dispose of money held by him in a manner which is beneficial to the mentally incompetent person and meets his daily needs. While the mentally incompetent person was in an institution and was receiving care, his needs were looked after by the institution. However when the patient is discharged into the community, the administrator is then responsible for looking after this person's needs. The administrator must then be given the power under the act, to pay for the patient's care and to purchase for the patient such items as are necessary for his daily existence. Many of the mentally incompetent persons who are discharged from the institution and into the community live on their own, in nursing homes or are being looked after in boarding rooms. These people are not so incompetent as not to be able to appreciate the things that competent people take for granted. They enjoy watching television and participating in sports and reading about the debates in the Saskatchewan Legislature. This amendment is intended to meet not only the need to provide shelter and food for these people but as well to give the administrator of estates the power to spend these peoples' funds in such a manner as to provide for them some of these other comforts. These needs have been met by the administrator in the past and his authority for so doing was section 7(a) of this Act. The amendment would clarify and expand section 7(a), making it clear that the administrator of estates can in fact, deal with the mentally incompetent person's property in such a manner as to met all of the mentally

incompetent person's needs. Section 7 deals with situations where the administrator is given the power to provide for the mentally incompetent person's dependants and to deal with the mentally incompetent person's real and personal property. However it does not specifically state what power if any, he has in spending the incompetent person's estate for the benefit and use of that person. This amendment clarifies and expands section 7 so as to provide that the administrator is empowered to spend the estate in such a manner which is beneficial and meets the mentally incompetent person's needs. The proposed amendment will make it clear that the administrator of estates as committee of the incompetent person can provide such daily necessities as previously mentioned to the mentally incompetent person out of the mentally incompetent person's estate. The amendment section 7(e) is intended merely to substitute the word 'consider' for the word 'deem' as a matter of drafting policy. The two words I think, mean the same and no consequential change is intended to result from this aspect of the bill. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Administration of Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of **An Act to amend The Police Act, 1974.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendment provides for the payment of witnesses and interpreters who are subpoenaed to appear before an inquiry or a hearing of an appeal conducted by the Saskatchewan Police Commission. There is no provision in the current act for payment of witnesses and interpreters who are required to appear before the Commission and it is considered necessary that such persons should be entitled to the same fees and allowances that a witness or an interpreter receives if subpoenaed to attend at a regular summary conviction trial.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 22 – **An Act to amend The Creditors' Relief Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members in their spare time if they are interested read Section 24 (2) of the Creditors' Relief Act. The amendment to this legislation was recommended by one of our judges of the District Court. Under The Creditors' Relief Act the judge is that of the District Court but his jurisdiction is confined to the amount of $1,200. The jurisdiction of the DC judge under the District Court Act is that of $5,000 as was mentioned by the member for Regina South a few minutes ago. The effect of this amendment would be to raise the jurisdiction of the court from that of $1,200 to $5,000 as it applies to applications under The Creditors' Relief Act being consistent with the present jurisdiction of the District Court Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW(Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 48 – **An Act to amend The Wills Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill and the next bill are very closely related. This bill is a consequential amendment resulting from the proposed amendment to The Intestate Succession Act which I shall be explaining in a moment, raising the preferential share of the intestate estate going to the surviving spouse from $10,000 to $40,000.

Section 31 presently provides that when a testator dies leaving a legacy in his will to a son, grandson, brother or sister and, for example, the son predeceases the testator but leaves behind a wife or children, that legacy goes to the son's family as if the son had died intestate, except that the son's widow is not to receive a preferential share of $10,000 as provided in The Intestate Succession Act, Section (4). It is necessary to change the $10,000 to $40,000 in order to conform with the general policy proposals in the amendments which follow in the next bill The Intestate Succession Act which will raise the surviving spouses preferential share of the deceased spouses estate from that $10,000 figure which has been around for quite awhile to $40,000.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW(Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 49 - **An Act to amend The Intestate Succession Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, indeed the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley has never spoken truer words in this Assembly since I've been here. Now, Mr. Speaker, in this bill we will be amending Section (4) The Intestate Succession Act, by increasing the preferential share of the intestate estate going directly to the widowed spouse as I indicated in the earlier bill in increasing that from $10,000 to $40,000. The present legislation was enacted in 1960 and the spouse is entitled to the first $10,000 of the deceased spouses estate. If there are no children, the surviving spouse receives the full estate. If there is only one child, the surviving spouse receives the first $10,000 and one half the remainder. Where there is more than one child, the surviving spouse receives the first $10,000 plus one third of the remainder. The proposed bill will increase the surviving spouses preferred share from $10,000 to $40,000. This is done in the spirit of keeping up with the obvious costs of living and the inflationary costs that have taken place in Canada since 1960 and may I say that those are considerable costs of inflation in Canada but I'll make that speech a little later on and at a more appropriate time.

Other provinces such as British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario are also giving consideration to or have increased the preferential share of the surviving spouses.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKl (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 46 - **An Act to amend The Marriage Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a little change of pace here. Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the Marriage Act being introduced for consideration by Legislature is the result of very careful consultation with a wide cross section of people in this province. We solicited the advice and the help on this issue from all the ecumenical leaders in Saskatchewan. The views and the opinions of the marriage commissioners in our province were sought and the implications in other provincial legislation has been carefully considered. These amendments are the consensus arrived at as a result of this extensive consultation about a matter which is very important to our society. Presently the law states, that in essence, no licence shall be issued to a person under 15 years of age and no marriage of such person shall be solemnized unless there is furnished a certificate of a duly qualified medical practitioner stating that immediate marriage is necessary in order to avoid illegitimacy of offspring. The act further states that a child marriage cannot take place, unless the consent of both parents is received. If this parental consent cannot be obtained, the

individual may apply to a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench or to a District Court judge for such consent. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the marriage of persons under 15 is a very rare occurrence in Saskatchewan. In 1970, there were three child marriages; in 1971 there were two; in 1972 there were five; in 1973 there were five; in 1974 there was one child marriage; in 1975 there was one child marriage; in 1976 there were three. One child marriage may very well be too many. Members and the public should be aware that there is no alarming change in the pattern of child marriages in this province. I suppose, therefore it might be asked why is there a need for an amendment to The Marriage Act at all? One of the reasons is that in the last year the present provision and the law was strongly questioned both in the Legislature and by the public. The criticism basically was that children under 15 were just too young and immature to become married and this prompted the consideration of the present law. But there are other reasons as well, Mr. Speaker.

We considered today, there is on the order paper an example of the concern for marriage and for the breakdown of marriage in the form of the Unified Family Court. as well as other things. Marriage is not something that should at any time or by any couple or by their parents be treated lightly. I read in an article in a church publication recently the statement, "Married people are partners in a formidable enterprise." When one considers that in marriage there is a commitment for life, there are usually children to raise and in the extended family there are other adults to be considered among many other obligations, I seem to think that this statement is fairly apt. All of these obligations should be carefully considered by any couple planning to marry; lack of this type of consideration, inadequate counselling in some cases and pressures from society including peers and parents have contributed to an increasing number of marriage breakdowns. These things as well as in some cases living conditions and the influence of the media have led to the destruction of modern marriages and, in fact, threatened the viability of the family. Society must become aware of what is happening and must make every effort to reverse the shift in the attitude of western society towards the importance of marriage in the family. Reports state that three quarters of all teenage marriages alone end in divorce. In the United States, one out of every three marriages is said break down and figures released by the federal government in Ottawa show an almost equally serious overall situation.

The amendments to The Marriage Act which we are considering here will not solve this problem but the public concern expressed about child marriages is in my view part of a larger concern about family breakdown, the heartache, the suffering and the casualties that result from it. The present legislation as I have said, that permits marriage of someone under age that is under 15 years of age when it is proven that the girl is pregnant is common in many provinces and is a reflection of the culture of the past. The weakness of this provision is that it may actually encourage that the girl become pregnant in order to be married and also the fact of a pregnancy does not make the marriage easier or prepare people for marriage. In one of the statements made by a church leader during our consultations on this bill it was said, and I quote him:

> A concern for the child will also lead us to consider that being born illegitimately is a lesser evil than having been the cause of a marriage that was ill prepared and resulted in misery, hospitality and eventual divorce.

Pregnancy in itself is not sufficient reason for marriage. There may be some who might say that making a legal requirement for the solemnization of marriage is an excessive intervention by the state in the lives of individuals. This criticism would be short-sighted in that surely it is important to protect the very young from contracting

responsibilities they cannot fulfil, or would with greater maturity choose to avoid.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . Cause for marriage . . .

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — You can read it in Hansard.

Once again, an excellent commentary in support of this was made by a church leader in response to our request for advice on this bill when he said, "We can emphasize that to opt for marriage is not only an act of freedom, but also a renunciation of many freedoms even before the law, and the acceptance of duties and responsibilities."

The bill being introduced proposes to raise the age at which a person can be married with parental consent from 15 to 16. This is the age at which marriage with parental consent is allowed in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Nova Scotia. Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland. Not only is this age in keeping with the majority of our sister provinces, 16 years of age is rather like a sub-age of majority. It is an acceptable age for certain acts of independence. At sixteen one can apply for a driver's licence, one can apply for social assistance on their own and one is no longer considered a juvenile by the courts.

A person under the age of 16 wishing to be married will require the approval of a Magistrate's Court Judge. The judge will take into account all relevant factors, including the maturity of both parties and, where applicable, the pregnancy of the female party. One of the things that this may lend to some significance is it will provide in most cases, if not in all cases, a very important cooling off period. A Magistrate's Court judge was chosen to make this decision because at this point it is the Magistrate's Court which handles most family related cases. The Magistrate's Court judge was felt to be the best person to make the decision as this court is somewhat local and, therefore the chances are more likely that the magistrate would be familiar with the background of those making the request.

If a person under the age of 16 does not receive the consent of the Magistrate's Court to marry and thus bears an illegitimate child, he or she can marry with parental consent at the age of 16 and are given the option to legitimize the birth of the child by applying to the division of Vital Statistics. The proposed amendment will raise the minimum age from 15 to 16 years as I have indicated. Parental consent as set out in sections 38 and 40 will continue to be a requirement. We believe that this revision will reflect more accurately society's present views on the subject of marriage between very young persons.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Marriage Act which our government has introduced into the Legislature constitute the fulfilment of a public commitment made during last Estimates when this document was discussed. With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this bill.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly be awfully frightened if the minister ever got to introduce an important piece of legislation in the House if he can take that long to rag around this change, which we think is a good change. God knows what he would do if he had some big piece of legislation before us. You know, Mr. Speaker, if somebody just wandered into the House in the midst of that speech and heard him curing the problems of pregnancy, cooling off young love,

keeping marital couples together forever, ending illegitimate births, they would think that the minister was the Pope - or God, one or the other.

Mr. Speaker, he has quoted everybody who has ever offered him any opinion at all about this legislation. The only people he didn't bother to quote were the member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) who moved the resolution to do just this and myself. I moved a bill last year amongst other things that there would be a referral to the court. Members opposite then said, no, they didn't think that that was really quite something that was appropriate.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, today, I have seen the Social Welfare Workers' Act changed which I moved an act along those lines and now this act and I gather. Mr. Speaker, that now that members opposite know I'm leaving they want to do good things that make me feel better and make me feel a little more wanted. You remember that when this caucus came into the House three years ago, amongst other things we said that, unlike previous oppositions they would find in us a far more constructive approach to government. You have seen from our caucus a series of bills and amendments, not just critical but also bills and amendments that we proposed to the government in good faith, and others said to the government, look we hope you will listen, we hope you will apply your mind and we hope you will listen to things that we present to you regardless of the source from which those things have come.

Frankly, I am very pleased to see the government listening in this area. I think that a reference to a court may well work in the way the minister has said as some sort of a cooling off period. You will find that in this session my colleagues and I will be moving other bills and bringing resolutions before you in that same spirit, in a positive spirit, trying to convince the government to do good things. I and my colleagues when we were elected and found that we were on the opposition benches and not in the government didn't take the sort of hangdog approach that some oppositions take, we took the view that our job still was to propose the best legislation that we could when we thought there was an opportunity to help the government whether we were on opposition benches or not.

I am very pleased to see this bill brought before the House. We will be supporting the bill, Mr. Speaker, but nonetheless I may have some further comments and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 25 - **An Act to amend The Urban Municipal Elections Act, 1968**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, The Urban Municipal Elections Act is designed to clarify three sections being introduced now to make sure that it's in place for next fall's municipal elections. This bill makes three changes, all of which are as a result of discussions held with the urban administrators and with urban municipal councils. The amendment of section 20 ensures that sitting members of an urban council are given a more equitable opportunity to run in any by-election held to fill a vacancy on their council. This section would normally apply in the billing of the vacancy raised by the resignation or the death of the mayor. Secondly, many of our smaller urbans desire to fill such a vacancy as quickly as possible but not rule out . . . (interjection of laughter) . . . (watch it now Tony) . . . existing council members from seeking the vacant position.

Under present legislation an elected member of council must resign his council seat at least ten days prior to the date of nomination and, therefore, this has resulted in some undue delays in filling vacancies. The amendment simply deletes the ten day requirement.

The amendment to section 38 contained in Bill 25, will make it legal for any candidate to have two agents present in the room while voting takes place but only one if he, himself, is present. The present legislation provides for a candidate and two agents to be present while voting is occurring but does not permit all three to remain in the room while the counting of votes takes place. Thus the amendment gives the same provision for over-seeing the voting process as it does for the counting of votes.

The last two amendments to section 74 contained in this bill are designed to speed up the process in the event of a recount. These amendments will require the deputy returning officer to maintain separate packets for each candidate and/or for each by-law.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, move that the said bill be now read a second time.

MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just make a comment or two. I think, as in many other bills, this should have a short title. We should probably call it 'The Henry Baker Bill'. I think one of the things we ought to do, Mr. Speaker, is if the minister would be prepared to accept an amendment I think we could probably support the suggestions that he has put forward. I think that the amendment ought to have something to do with this, that if Henry runs and beats Tony, Tony automatically gets the consolation prize and he's the mayor and if it goes the other way around, Henry keeps the job as mayor.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the poor citizens? (Laughter from the floor)

MR. PENNER: — We think, Mr. Speaker, that this bill like many others that have been put before us tonight has a number of very significant aspects and we'll support it.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 50 - **An Act to provide for the Postponement of the Tabling of Certain Documents.**

He said: Hon. members will note that a great majority of the annual reports have been tabled, however, there are a very few which aren't, whose preparation is not yet complete due to some reasons, printing, auditing and so forth. Under the existing legislation The Tabling of Documents Act, 1973 documents are required to be laid before or submitted to the Legislative Assembly by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or a member of the Executive Council or by any other person directed by an act to do so. And if the session of the Legislature commences after September, those documents are required to be laid before or submitted to the Legislative Assembly within 15 days after the session commences or within 15 days after the document is received by those persons, whichever is later.

Mr. Speaker, a strict interpretation of the act requires that the documents received prior to the adjournment of this present sitting but received less than 15 days prior to the adjournment must be laid before the Legislature by the 15th day, even though that

period expires on a day between the adjournment and the reconvening of the Session when the House is not, in actual fact, sitting.

Mr. Speaker, members will recall that during the 1973-74 session and the 1975-76 session of this Legislature similar acts were passed allowing the tabling of documents at any time during those sessions but those acts only applied to the session sitting at the time of the enactment.

Because of the problem which I raised earlier involving some reports such as Sask Media, Student Aid Fund, Liquor Board, it is deemed advisable to follow a similar procedure during the present session and the proposed Tabling of Documents Act, 1977-78 would make a similar provision for the tabling of documents placing this procedure in the same position as it was during the 1973-74 and 1974-75 sessions of the Legislature and allow for the tabling of documents at any time during the current session. I, therefore, move, Mr. Speaker, that the said bill be now read a second time.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I urge every member of this Assembly to vote against this bill and I speak not only on behalf of the members of the opposition but on both sides of the House. I want to tell you why, Mr. Speaker, very, very briefly.

I suppose that all members of the Assembly, including those on the opposite side of the House, are elected to this Assembly and the whole concept of democratic government is fiscal responsibility. The whole key to government in a democracy is representative government examining the books of government in order to ascertain if expenditures are legitimate or not.

Today we had an example, Mr. Speaker, where an annual report was tabled before this Assembly and it was not even audited. We also had an example, Mr. Speaker, of a bill introduced in this Assembly asking for carte blanche privilege to borrow $500 million.

The net expenditures of the government of Saskatchewan, when you eliminate the federal contribution, were about $800 million or $900 million. They are asking the civil servants in the Saskatchewan Power Building to have the power to borrow $500 million to do what they want and not even report about it for a year and half later. They are asking this government to pass a bill of this Assembly to give the Saskatchewan Power Corporation the right to spend more money than the entire Department of Health, the Department of Welfare, or 50 per cent of the ministers sitting in that government. Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of arrogance and insensitivity to the democratic process that this NDP government has?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — To turn around and request this Assembly to give the power of one Crown corporation the ability to spend more than 50 per cent or to borrow more than 50 per cent of the net budget of the entire province of Saskatchewan in one fiscal year without any kind of authority or responsibility but on their own reconnaissance. Mr. Speaker, is an insult to this Assembly and the democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example. We have had, for example, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — a very embarrassing document which the Minister of the Potash Corporation was forced to table in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I suggest

that that particular document will get a great deal of discussion in the province of Saskatchewan in the weeks and months ahead, a great deal of discussion. But wouldn't it be nice and handy for the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation to lay that document on the table the day that this Assembly prorogues next March. Wouldn't it be convenient for a government going into an election campaign, with no sense of responsibility, to report to this Assembly or the people of Saskatchewan about their fiscal management or their irresponsibility until the day the election is called.

Let me give you a further example. Next spring, in 1979, there is a provincial election about to be called. On March 15, the Premier decides that he will prorogue the House and call the election, so he calls in his Cabinet ministers and says to hold onto the annual reports and lay them on the table. They all lay them on the table and then the Premier prorogues the House and calls the election. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of abuse that is possible under this piece of legislation and I hope that the backbenchers on the government side of the House will have the same sense of responsibility and concern for the democratic process in this province to turn down this bill as I hope you will turn down that bill on the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and every bill of its kind and like.

Mr. Speaker, I have more to say on this bill and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. E. KAEDING (Minster of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill 8 - **An Act to amend The Agricultural Incentives Act, 1973.**

Ha said: Mr. Speaker, in 1973 the New Democratic government of Saskatchewan introduced The Agricultural Incentives Act. This was a pioneering legislation of the type for which Saskatchewan has developed a reputation in North America. I need only refer to the hospitalization legislation in 1947, to medicare in 1962 and to government insurance legislation, to put into proper perspective what I mean when I refer to pioneering creative types of legislation for which Saskatchewan is noted.

If you do not think that the Farm Start program has been considered by other jurisdictions in North America to be like the first furrow broken in a new field, I will only refer to you the fact that most other provincial governments in Canada have legislation which in many respects bears a similarity to the Farm Start program and the same can be said for many American states.

I wish to note that the New Democratic Party and the CCF government before it have not only developed a reputation for pioneering legislation but that this is in contrast to the inability of those great innovators across the floor to carry out their promises. In both 1964 and in 1967 the Liberal government at the time made election promises to establish a program which, in their vague way of making promises, bore some similarity to the Farm Start program we have introduced. Of course, they are once again playing their middle of the road game of borrowing ideas from the NDP, but never implementing them.

Within two years after we had assumed government responsibility in 1971 we completed thorough research of the kind of program needed, introduced the legislation, established the administrative procedures and gave out the first loans and grants under the new Farm Start program. That's progress.

That, Mr. Speaker, is follow-through on a pioneering legislation of programs needed by the people of Saskatchewan and is the reason why the people of Saskatchewan are recognized as pioneers in North America and the people of Saskatchewan respect this New Democratic Party government.

The opposition should bear in mind that it is for reasons like Farm Start that the NDP government was returned to office by the people of Saskatchewan in 1975. There is one other reason why the voters in Pelly constituency returned to us one of the best members they have ever had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — The Farm Start program was set up to deal with the problems that entrants to farming are facing today. New farmers and small farmers were having a tremendously difficult time in not only getting in, in the first place, but acquiring enough assets to set up a reasonably-sized farm unit. They could not compete with other well established farmers, or non-farmers for land, and up to the point in time that Farm Start was established there was very little assistance for them to try to intensify production on a smaller land base. They were simply left out in the cold. The result was having a devastating effect on the rural community and fewer and fewer farmers survived dictates of the so-called 'natural economic forces'. It is old hat now, Mr. Speaker. I believe that most thinking men recognize that the old natural economic forces have to be interfered with to give new and small farmers a chance to acquire land, a chance to intensify production of their land base, and a chance to be assured of reasonably stable prices for their products.

Land Bank has given many an opportunity to acquire land. Farm Start has given many an opportunity to get better production off their land and stabilization programs such as SHARP have given farmers assurance of reasonable prices for their products.

These three thrusts, in unison, complete the full circle of creating a more stable farming industry and Farm Start has proven to be a major component of that endeavor.

In 1971 Statistics Canada reported that there were 76,690 census farms in Saskatchewan. In June of 1976 they counted 70,958 farm holdings. This represents a decline in numbers of farms of 1,200 per year. However, when this is compared to the decline in the period 1966-1971 the rate is very favorable indeed. In 1966 there were 85,600 farms and the average annual disappearance between 1966 and 1971 was 1,743 farms per year. Our own calculations are that each year in the period 1968 to 1972, 2,529 farmers quit and only 768 farmers started new operations. Our estimates are that for the ten years to follow 1972, because of the high age of the Saskatchewan farmers, which is over 50 years, that an average of 2,836 farmers would be retiring each year because of age alone. This does not include those who quit for many other reasons. Therefore, because the net decline per year was only 1,200 between 1971 and 1976 and because the number of farmers quitting must have been very high, there must have been many new entrants into farming and many small farmers were able to hang on rather than to quit. I think programs like Farm Start have had a great deal to do with it.

To date Farm Start has 2.660 farmers under the Farm Start program and they have undertaken almost 3,000 new expansions. Total dollars approved to these individuals is over $76 million. Of this money approved, over $55 million has been disbursed in loans and almost $12 million in grants. With that money these new and expanding

farmers have purchased approximately 100,000 beef cows, 9,000 dairy cows and 12,000 sows. You can see that the impact has been fairly major.

In the last couple of years loan activity has dropped off mainly because of the lack of optimism in the beef industry. However, that activity is beginning to pick up again and Farm Start estimates that there will be at least 550 expansions this year.

Farm Start has been a good and well accepted, yet responsible public program, because of its unique design. Let me illustrate the major essence of the Farm Start Program in its ability to ride with the farmer who goes into livestock production. This is illustrated in the way it is designed so that farmers will have the ability to repay their loans regardless of whether livestock prices are low or high and still have enough left over for their personal living expenses.

The province recognizes that it would be folly to develop a program for livestock expansion that was not tied at all times to net returns and livestock production and the ability of a farmer to repay his loan. The long term repayment period for the loan is there because it reduces the annual payment and makes it possible for the farmer to repay within the constraints of his income from his livestock operation. The interest rate is now at 7 per cent in contrast to market interest rates which are much higher. Once again, this is done to further reduce the farmer's annual payments and to make it possible to expand and repay from his earnings of the livestock operation. Likewise, the grant effectively reduces the amount of annual payment that the individual will have to make. These three features have been incorporated specifically in recognition of the problems that livestock producers may have in expanding and repaying for their loans from their means based on the returns in livestock production.

When we developed the program we didn't stop there. We recognized that in an expanding operation that returns may not be forthcoming for a certain period of time as a farmer expands and gets his operation under way. Therefore, we built in a further delay feature before the first payment was expected. For almost all loans first payments of the loans advanced to date is not expected for the first 19 to 24 months but after the date of which expansion starts. Consequently, with these features built in, the Farm Start plan under average situations gives the farmer an excellent opportunity of meeting his obligations with Farm Start. I am sure that you will all recognize that these features in itself are unique and our recognition of the problems that are faced by the livestock industry in the province. No commercial lending institution will provide loans for so long a prepayment period for livestock production. No commercial institution will provide grants which would make it more feasible for livestock expansion. Furthermore, very few other governments in North America have loans for livestock production with the same quality features.

But we did not stop there, Mr. Speaker. We recognized that despite the low annual payments that are featured under the program, there will be years when net returns from livestock production will be very low. We also recognize that there would be years when the net returns for livestock production would be very good. It did not make much sense to us that as a lending institution we should expect that annual payments would be the same in all years despite the ups and downs in the livestock sector. We recognize that there were cycles in the livestock industry and that there were systematical occurrences of periods of low net returns and periods of good net returns. We saw that if we were to encourage livestock production and encourage people to stay in livestock production during the poor years, repayment would have to be tied to this phenomenon in the industry. This idea of tying repayments of loans to the fortunes in

the livestock industry was innovative and revolutionary. It was a break in tradition from the banking world. Bankers could not understand that we would not expect a farmer to starve his family and make his full payments in a year of poor returns from livestock production. To them it was incomprehensible but we were willing to bet not on bankers but on farmers.

Effective December 1, 1975, we implemented a flexible repayment feature, the Farm Start. Schedules were calculated for beef and hog enterprises. As expected returns in hog production were very good and the schedule indicated that no downward adjustment in the annual repayment for hogs would be required on payments due within the next few years. However, the calculations of this schedule for beef operations indicated that a dollar adjustment of annual payments required for beef loans certainly were justified vis-à-vis the annual returns from beef operations. Notices were, therefore, sent out to Farm Start borrowers who had payments on beef loans due on December of 1975. They were advised that it was their right and I should emphasize that it was their right to make as little as 40 per cent of normal payment if they so chose. Of course they were also counselled and considered in their own personal and unique situation what the implications may be for them of opting for such a reduced payment. They were counselled to consider that a reduced payment now inevitably means that they will have to catch up on their payments sometime in the future. This catch up would be when the livestock situation improved. They would then be ready to higher the normal payment as long as the livestock situation was good and until they had caught up on their normal payments. They were asked to consider their cash flow situation now and what they foresaw in the distant future. One of the things they were asked to consider was that if their cash flow was good now, primarily because of good grain prices, that they may want to consider making the normal payments. They would then not be faced with a higher than normal payment at some time in the future when they might like to have some extra cash for instance to expand their operation.

We gave them that choice, Mr. Speaker, but we designed it so that they could fully understand the situation now and make judgments for the future and this is all very consistent with good farm planning. So we have implemented, so to speak, an industry and an adjustment under repayment on beef loans under the Farm Start program. New schedules were calculated as time went on. Apparently beef producers are expected to make a 50 per cent of normal repayment while hog producers are still expected to make the normal payment. We think it makes good sense for the farmer to repay less than the normal amount in a poor year and repay more than the normal amount in good years. By this adjustment the farmers will still be able to live well and yet repay his loan over a 15 year period.

Now this is a stabilization program pertaining to the repayment of loans. We recognize that there may be a unique situation which requires even more flexibility. We recognize

that there would be unique financial problems experienced by farmers who had a good long run potential enterprise but were very constraining right now. We, therefore, felt it necessary to be able to postpone his payments in certain instances, instances where an individual had a great deal of difficulty in making even the 40 per cent payment but demonstrated good long potential and could show in the future that he could catch up on those payments.

Since 1976, we have been operating on this postponement of payment feature in cases where it is warranted and provided that it can be shown that there is some time in the future when the individual can catch up on his payment. In most cases we have been postponing up to 100 per cent of his payments. We have to be very careful when we're making adjustments of this kind. We can justify flexible repayments for the normal farming situation when we tie it into the net returns of livestock production. When we get into abnormal situations where the repayment capacity of the individual is not related to the net returns in livestock production. We must be very careful. We can't be willy-nilly postponing payments which may get an individual out of an immediate problem or help resolve an immediate problem but make the situation down the road much worse for him. Therefore, we insist that when we are postponing payments we must be assured that we are not simply postponing an inevitable problem which may, more than anything else, be related to the management capability of that person.

Financial management for an individual borrower and for a lender is very delicate. Financial dealings with an individual must be tailored to the individual's situation. I believe we have been very careful under the Farm Start program. We have developed features that are tailored to each individual borrower's needs and this is much more than possibly could be imagined under any other commercial lending program, or for that matter, programs of any other government.

Incidentally, history has shown that of cattlemen given an option to utilize flexible repayments that about 50 per cent have opted for the minimum payment while 40 per cent have selected a normal 100 per cent payment and 10 per cent have selected a figure somewhere between the two. To me this indicates that we have done a reasonably good job in establishing farm enterprises that can survive and maintain normal repayment, even under such very severe conditions as experienced by the beef industry.

There are other indicators of success of the program as well. In April of 1977 Farm Start had 276 active hog producers, many of these are quite large. They are not the inners and outers of the industry. Twenty-five of these were marketing, or were being established to market, over 1,000 hogs per year. The Hog Marketing Commission figures back in April indicated that only 52 farms in the province were marketing over 1,000 hogs per year. So you can see that Farm Start recipients are providing 50 per cent of that production which is over 1,000 hogs per year.

Farm Start has been making loans and grants in the Outlook irrigation area. Forty per cent of the irrigation farmers have received assistance through the Farm Start program. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I think that what we have said is enough to illustrate the importance of this well-conceived and well-managed program.

You may point out and say, "Yes, but we have had failures too." And, of course, we have. We are dealing with a higher risk than normal and less secure individuals. But that is the way it should be, or we would not be doing our job. We have delinquencies but we do not consider them to be abnormal. We have had some failures and some bankruptcies, but these have not been large in number. Occasionally we feel bad when we have done all we can for a client and he still has to quit. But rather than reflecting on the failures that we have had, we should reflect instead on the approximately 95 per cent success rate that we have experienced. That exceeds what most people and most financial institutions would expect.

**As you know, Farm Start has also administered under The Agricultural Incentives Act other programs that the government was asked to assume, in 1974 it gave out almost $35 million in advances to cow-calf producers who were reeling under the impact of disastrous market prices for beef. In 1975 it gave out almost $42 million in advances in a renewed program. In 1976 a total of 29,076 cattlemen in Saskatchewan, received a total of $80,533,000 in assistance from Farm Start. Almost $50 million of that was in the form of loans, while $30,875,000 was in outright grants. I think you can agree that it is important to have the Legislative authority to continue to provide assistance under the long-term loan and grant program and also to be able to handle emergency programs such as the Beef Industry Assistance Program.

Section 29, subsection (1) of The Agricultural Incentives Act limits the borrowing powers of the corporation for capital purposes to $150 million principal outstanding. It is now estimated that by 1982 the amount outstanding under loans on the long-term grant and loan program may be $150 million in loans and that it will top $200 million by 1986. In 1979 the amount outstanding in loans on the long-term grant and loan program is estimated to be approximately $87 million, but with the roll-over provisions under the cash advances from the 1976 Beef Industry Assistance Program, the total outstanding under The Agricultural Incentives Act may get dangerously close to our existing figure of $150 million limit. Now is the time to make the change, Mr. Speaker. I recommend that we make the change now to increase the capital constraints under The Agricultural Incentives Act from $ 150 million to $225 million. This change will enable Farm Start to continue to deliver the high degree of service expected of it by our rural population and to handle emergency programs that may, from time to time, prove necessary.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will get the full confidence and full support of all members opposite and I, therefore, move second reading of the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the minister back to Saskatchewan and back to the Legislature. We were beginning to miss you.

I didn't expect such a long deliberation on such a short amendment involving such a great expenditure. What we are looking at is an amendment. basically. to The Agricultural Incentives Act which was introduced in 1973 and which is an act to provide financial assistance to encourage and promote the development and expansion of the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan. That's not too difficult to disagree with that concept. When we look at that act which was introduced and passed in 1973 its borrowing limits were set at $100 million. The next year they increased it by $50 million to $150 million and now you are increasing it by another $75 million to $225 million.

Mr. the Minister of Agriculture has heard my views before on the direction our agricultural industry is going in this province . That is very simple.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . orderly marketing . . .

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, the member suggests orderly marketing . . . he might note that it was a Conservative government that introduced the Wheat Board and when it was tossed out it was re-introduced again by a Conservative government. We are quite aware of orderly marketing and all your jibber jabber and your hooting and hollering over there about the Conservative members being opposed to orderly market is just that, just jibber jabber. You are looking for something. You're grasping for straws and if I was going down hill as fast as you people I would be grasping for something too.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture goes on with a great speech about all of these wonderful programs and I thought for a moment, Mr. Speaker, you were going to call him to order because he was discussing the medicare plan, SGIO and heaven only knows what. I don't know what I should discuss. I could maybe go on to the Department of Highways or the Department of Labour (I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) is in the House tonight and in his seat. That's always nice to see.) But I am not going to do that, Mr. Speaker, because I know what the rules of this Legislative Assembly are. (Interjection)

You ask the Minister of Agriculture - you can suggest it's time for me to sit down because I'm going to tell you you've been out here for a long time and for that reason I haven't been able to get on my feet. (Interjection)

Anyway now that the members opposite have had their time to air their frustrations once more as they do every day, I might continue. The minister failed to point out some of the problems which they are having with regard to Farm Start, which is the reason for increasing the borrowing. He says that there is more need for expenditures and assistance to the agricultural industry in this province and there is but it's a question, Mr. Minister, of how you are going to go about spending those funds that you are asking this Assembly to approve an increase of tonight.

You know as well as I do, Mr. Minister, that the farmers in this province are in debt not only to federal lending institutions but provincial lending institutions, the banks, credit unions and the suppliers. I wonder if you have ever put any thought to the fact that you might be just taking them behind an eight ball that they are never going to get out from.

I noticed, too, Mr. Minister, that you are riding fairly high on your programs and that may well be because you've got some pretty wide acceptance of the Land Bank Program by the American people. I might suggest to you. Mr. Minister, that the people in the United States are not going to be voting in Saskatchewan on these programs. Yes, he mentioned Pelly, and there is no question that you got a lot of votes up there because if you look at the amount of Land Bank land in the Pelly constituency per capita it is mostly there.

Mr. Speaker, because of the great length and deliberations on this rather short amendment to a reasonably old bill requiring an increase in the total expenditures, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, before the member sits down . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Will the member permit a question? The member has asked leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 51 – **An Act Respecting the Registration, Application and Implantation of Animal Identification Marks.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to provide for the registration of all permanent marks of ownership for livestock except tattoos which are administered by Agriculture Canada. The bill simply replaces that aspect of the present plan of brand inspection which governs the registration of a brand. Use of marks to show proof of ownership for livestock has a long history in the settlement of the great plains of North America. Many ranchers regard them as party of their heritage. Registered marks are the most practical method of identifying livestock. Many states and several provinces in the western part of North America have their own central registry system for animal marks. To be sure of protection in the use of a mark a producer must have exclusive use of that mark. To avoid duplication in the issuance or use of a mark requires an efficient central registry to administer to the registration of all animal marks.

The present Central Animal Identification file which is administered by my department has nearly 26,000 actively used brands. During the last year and one-half the system has been computerized to improve the speed and efficiency with which the program can function. For the sum of $2 a producer can register a brand for exclusive use for a period of four years. In October of this year the new electronic system was able to reprint and prepare for mailing 7,000 renewal notices on an overnight run at SaskTel.

In recent years losses from rustling have continued to plague the livestock industry. In the past year alone it has been estimated that the losses from rustling amounted to something like $750,000. Every year the SARM in its regional and annual conventions has asked the government to tighten up its regulations. The Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association has also made similar requests at their annual meetings. My department has met with these officials and these organizations in an attempt to

resolve the problem. It is now mandatory for all livestock with two exceptions to be properly manifested prior to being transported. My department can trace the ownership of any branded animals which are reported missing or stolen. Six RCMP vet co-ordinators are working in the province and brand inspectors are doing a good job of reading brands and reporting discrepancies. I am confident that for branded animals our program provides the best and the most efficient search capability that exists in North America.

The key to the success of the program requires that brands be registered and then properly applied to the animals. This bill makes provision for new technology in electronic animal identification which is presently being researched. It enables the licensing of dealers and distributors of identification equipment. This is necessary to assure co-ordination in the allotment of parks for animals to ensure the principle of exclusiveness.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents an upgrading of existing legislation including the adoption of modern technology and I would therefore want to move second reading of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — It is my intention at the conclusion of my brief remarks to adjourn the debate on this particular bill. Let me say before we get further into the bill that I'm very, very pleased that the Minister of Agriculture has two speech writers. He has one that is extremely long-winded and one that is rather brief. I wish he would use the one that is rather brief a little more often than he would use the one that he did on Bill No. 8 which we dealt with a short while ago.

My initial reaction to Bill 51, which is now before us, was such that I felt that there were segments of the bill which we would have no were difficulty in supporting. There other segments of the bill which I have some questions about and the minister in his remarks today certainly did not answer any of those questions or doubts which I have.

One question I would like to pose first of all and that deals with section (a) of section (2) of this act. Let me just read that section to the members of this Assembly. It is in this act the interpretation of the word ""'animal' means any herd or any head of cattle or other animal of the bovine species; any horse or other animal of the equine species; any sheep, goat or swine or any inter-species hybrid of the same". Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, just exactly what does – 'or any inter-species hybrid of the same' - mean? Is the Minister of Agriculture saying that he has knowledge or his department has knowledge that they are now capable of crossbreeding a hog and a horse? What happens, Mr. Speaker? What will be the result of that crossbreeding? Will you get a hog that is capable of running a fantastic distance or will you get a horse that is able to mature in six months? I think, Mr. Speaker, these are questions that I hope the Minister of Agriculture will be able to answer before we tackle the more serious aspects of this particular bill. The member for Regina South was wondering whether a cow and a goat could be crossed under this particular bill and if that's the case, I imagine he might get an animal where he didn't have to have a stool quite so high when he wanted to milk that particular crossbreed.

Another aspect of the bill, however, Mr. Speaker, and this is something that might be taken on a bit more serious note is the ability or the authority under this act for inspectors, who are hired or appointed by the Department of Agriculture, to search the

residence or the farm of an individual without a warrant. They must have a warrant to search the particular individual's dwelling but under this act they do not require a warrant to search the individual's barns or the land or the holdings which he has. That may in turn be all right in the event of the RCMP conducting those types of brand inspections or searches. I question, however, the authority and the training of some of the people who may be hired in order to carry out their responsibility such as this.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not deal with another aspect of a question which I must pose. What happens if an individual rancher has a brand registered; he brands his particular cow; that cow is sold after two or three years to a neighbor or someone else down the line, other than his bill of sale, what proof does that individual farmer have under this act that that animal, in effect, is his when he is not allowed under this act to change any portion of that particular brand if that brand is applied on the outside of the animal? These are questions which we have in regard to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask leave at this time to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 9 - **An Act to amend The Farm Security Act.**

He said: This is a short one. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak to Bill No. 9 to amend The Farm Security Act. It has been traditional, since the act was originally passed in 1944, to extend this act for a period of three years. The purpose of reviewing the act every three years is to ensure that it continues to serve the purpose for which it was originally intended. Thus, the amendment before the Legislature today has the effect of extending the provisions of this act to the years 1979, 1980 and 1981. This act protects the farm operator who has probably rented land or land being purchased under an agreement for sale which is mortgaged by specifying the portion of the crop which may be retained by him for purposes of paying taxes, cost production and family living expenses in years of crop failure. The provisions of this act become applicable when the average value of production per acre sown is less than the value of 10 bushels of No. 1 CW spring wheat.

Mr. Speaker, events of the 1977 crop year emphasize the importance of the bill now before us. While the exceptionally long and continuous period of favorable harvest weather in October enabled completion of harvesting in Saskatchewan this year, I think we can agree that we were very fortunate. Prior to the commencement of the favorable harvest weather I referred to, I believe most of us were considering the possibility that much of the 1977 crop would remain in the swath over winter. If this had happened there is no doubt that many Saskatchewan farmers would have been in very serious financial difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, many Saskatchewan farmers are experiencing serious financial difficulties this year as a result of a renewed cost-price squeeze even though they have been able to harvest their crops. I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that the importance of this bill has been reduced somewhat since 1971 as a result of markedly increased use being made of crop insurance in Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan farmers. During the past production season roughly 48,000 Saskatchewan farmers purchased over $700 million worth of protection under the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance program. However, in spite of this remarkable progress in respect to the application of the Crop Insurance program in Saskatchewan there are still many farmers who have not elected to protect themselves through purchases of crop insurance. This bill before us is still

therefore, extremely important to the remaining 30 per cent of Saskatchewan farmers who have not protected themselves by utilizing the Crop Insurance program.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the Crop Insurance Board is continuing to expand these provisions of crop insurance to include a broader coverage of crops with emphasis in recent years being placed on research which will lead to the possibility of offering insurance coverage for more of the pulse crops and possibly vegetable crops. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill are required by many Saskatchewan farmers and I hope that this bill to amend The Farm Security Act will receive the unanimous support of the Legislature. I move second reading of the bill.

MR. MALONE: — I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned

The Assembly adjourned at 9:07 o'clock p.m.